

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2004

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	09/295,463 04/13/1999		LEX M. COWSERT	ISIS-3455	7206
	35807	7590 06/09/2004		EXAMINER	
		WEST LLP		MARSCHEL	, ARDIN H
	801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94014			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1631	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/295,463	COWSERT ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Ardin Marschel	1631			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	01 March 2004 and 31 March 200)4 .			
•	·	This action is non-final.				
,	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 55,56,58-72,74-87 and 99-102 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 55,56,58-72,74-87, and 99-102 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)[10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some coll None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen	t(s)					
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/S r No(s)/Mail Date	,	mary (PTO-413) fail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/1/04 and 3/31/04 has been entered.

Applicants' arguments, filed 3/1/04 and 3/31/04, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

NEW MATTER

Claims 55, 56, 58-72, 74-87, and 99-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This NEW MATTER rejection is reiterated and maintained from the previous office action, mailed 10/30/03, regarding claim amending as filed 8/4/03. Applicants argue that pages 16-21 of the specification as filed supports the claim amending implicitly. In response, said pages have been considered as to written support therein

Art Unit: 1631

cited. The closest written support for the claim amending regarding thermodynamic property evaluation followed and at least one other criteria selected from target accessibility etc. as in claim 55, for example, is found on page 19 of the specification at lines 16-27, wherein properties are cited as being scored following the calculation of thermodynamic properties. Conflicting with the instant claim selection none of the properties therein listed in said lines 16-27 are selections of the instant claims. Specifically, said page 19 firstly lists the number of strings of four guanosine residues in a row. Secondly, said page 19 lists three guanosine in a row. Neither of these properties are listed as options connected with thermodynamic property evaluation as in instant claim 55, nor the other independent claims amended as such. Consideration of the remainder of the properties of said page 19 citation also fails to reveal any as being evaluated along with a thermodynamic property as now claimed. It is also noted that a thermodynamic property scoring is cited within a target accessibility section on said page 19 and not as an added selection as now claimed in the instant claims. Page 20 is cited by applicants regarding a selection of a uniform distribution of target nucleic acid sequences which is one of the instant claim 55 selection options. However, this page 20 selection is not merely scored along with a thermodynamic property as now in claim 55, but rather is conditionally evaluated if a decision is made to target the functional regions as argued by applicants. This is not what is presently set forth in claim 55 regarding combining thermodynamic property evaluation with such an added selection. Thus, this page 20 citation fails to support the combined evaluation limitation that has been amended into the instant claims. Applicants also cite a page 21 citation but again

Art Unit: 1631

as with the page 20 citation a decision is described therewith which is not in the instantly claimed combination as now claimed in the instant claims.

It is noted that the NEW MATTER regarding the phrase "and combinations thereof" has not been specifically argued and is still deemed NEW MATTER.

PRIOR ART

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 55, 56, 58-72, 74-87, and 99-102 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agrafiotis et al. (P/N 5,463,564); taken in view of Uhlmann et al. (1990); taken further in view of Dower et al. (P/N 5,639,603); taken further in view of either of Haff et al. (P/N 5,720,923) or Harris et al. (P/N 5,650,122).

This rejection is reiterated and maintained from the previous office action, mailed 10/30/03. Applicants only argue this rejection based on the NEW MATTER as noted above and no further. Therefore, this rejection is maintained for reasons of record due to the continued presence of NEW MATTER in the claims.

Art Unit: 1631

No claim is allowed.

All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the Central PTO Fax Center. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993)(See 37 CFR § 1.6(d)). The Central PTO Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ardin Marschel, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0718. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8 A.M. to 4 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0722.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instrument Examiner, Tina Plunkett, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0549.

Art Unit: 1631

June 7, 2004

Andin H. Marschel Ardin H. Marschel PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 6